

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for taking to time to conduct a personal interview with Applicants' representatives on September 23, 2004, and for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The amendments discussed during the personal interview are incorporated into this Response. The office action dated October 17, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 1, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 30 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-38 are pending. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 1-38.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7, 11, 14, 17-33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,344,883 to Yamada (hereinafter "Yamada"). Applicants traverse the rejection because Yamada fails to teach or suggest the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. Specifically, Yamada fails to teach or suggest a multi-domain liquid crystal display device that includes "a dielectric frame located exclusively in a region other than where said pixel electrode is formed, said dielectric frame distorting electric field applied to said liquid crystal layer" as recited in independent claim 1; and "a dielectric frame surrounding said pixel region, said dielectric frame distorting electric field applied to said liquid crystal layer and said dielectric frame located exclusively in a region other than where said pixel electrode is formed" as recited in independent claim 30.

Because Yamada fails to teach or suggest at least these features recited in independent claims 1 and 30, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5, 7, 11, 14 and 17-29, and claim 30 and its dependent claims 31-33 and 35 are allowable over Yamada. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 11, 14, 17-33 and 35 are respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 8-10, 34, and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,117, issued to Horie et al. (hereinafter "Horie"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because neither Yamada nor Horie, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited

in the claims of the present application. In particular, Yamada and Horie fail to teach or suggest a multi-domain liquid crystal display device that includes “a dielectric frame located exclusively in a region other than where said pixel electrode is formed, said dielectric frame distorting electric field applied to said liquid crystal layer” as recited in independent claim 1; and “a dielectric frame surrounding said pixel region, said dielectric frame distorting electric field applied to said liquid crystal layer and said dielectric frame located exclusively in a region other than where said pixel electrode is formed” as recited in independent claim 30.

Claims 6 and 8-10 depend from independent claim 1. Claims 34 and 36-38 depend from independent claim 30. By virtue of their dependence from claims 1 and 30, claims 6, 8-10, 34 and 36-38 also contain the respective allowable features recited in independent claims 1 and 30. Accordingly, claims 6, 8-10, 34 and 36-38 are allowable over any combination of Yamada and Horie. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 8-10, 34 and 36-38 are respectfully requested.

Claims 12, 13, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Related Art (ARA) in view of Yamada and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,963,290 to Murai et al. (hereinafter “Murai”). Applicants traverse the rejection because neither ARA, Yamada nor Murai, analyzed alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. For example, ARA, Yamada and Murai fail to teach or suggest a multi-domain liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, “a dielectric frame located exclusively in a region other than where said pixel electrode is formed” as recited in independent claims 12, 13, 15 and 16 of the present application. Because ARA, Yamada and Murai fail to teach or suggest at least these features of independent claims 12, 13, 15 and 16, claims 12, 13, 15 and 16 are allowable over any combination of ARA, Yamada and Murai. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application

in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: October 1, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant